

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/614,392	07/07/2003	John K. Fraser	MA9658DIV2	5906	
75	90 03/30/2006		EXAMINER		
Kenton R. Mullins			LANKFORD JR, LEON B		
Stout, Uxa, Buy	an & Mullins, LLP				
Suite 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
4 Venture			1651	<u></u>	
Irvine, CA 92	618		DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,392	FRASER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leon Lankford	1651	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
· •	VIC CET TO EVOIDE 2 M	ONTHIEL OF THIRTY (20) DAVE	,
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuted that the provision of the maximum statutory period. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  reply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07</u> .	luly 2003		
,	is action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ers prosecution as to the merits i	ie
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	•	
Globba III decertained Will the practice and	an parto quayro, roco era		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 93-96 is/are pending in the application	on.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.	•	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>93-96</u> is/are rejected.		. !	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		: :	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers		· :	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er	:	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 July 2003</u> is/are: a		ted to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	·- · ·- ·		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•		
Duis mites som dem 25 11 0 0 0 440			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documen			
2. Certified copies of the priority documen			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		received in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea		received	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	roi me cermied cobies not	received.	
		. :	
		÷ -	
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		s)/Mail Date  nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
<ul> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>	6) Other:	•	

Art Unit: 1651

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 93-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant claims a method of treating a patient but it is unclear for what.

Applicant has failed to claim for what a patient is being treated and thus the claims do not particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Further, the "tissue removal system" is clearly critical to the claimed invention yet applicant does not detail; what this "system" is or how it is used. As claimed it is unclear if the system is a method or an apparatus.

It is unclear if the patient from whom the tissue is removed is the same as to who the cells are administered. Applicant should clarify.

The term "stem cells' in this particular case is indefinite. There are several types of multipotent cells which may be associated with adipose tissue and thus the intending

Art Unit: 1651

scope of applicant's claim is unclear. Applicant should more clearly define the cells in question.

Please note that the language of a claim must make it clear what subject matter the claim encompasses to adequately delineate its "metes and bounds". See, e.g., the following decisions: In re Hammack, 427 F 2d. 1378, 1382, 166 USPQ 204, 208 (CCPA 1970); In re Venezia 530 F 2d. 956, 958, 189 USPQ 149, 151 (CCPA 1976); In re Goffe, 526 F 2d. 1393, 1397, 188 USPQ 131, 135 (CCPA 1975); In re Watson, 517 F 2d. 465, 477, 186 USPQ 11, 20 (CCPA 1975); In re Knowlton 481 F 2d. 1357, 1366, 178 USPQ 486, 492 (CCPA 1973). The courts have also indicated that before claimed subject matter can properly be compared to the prior art, it is essential to know what the claims do in fact cover. See, e.g., the following decisions: In re Steele, 305 F 2d. 859, 134 USPQ 292 (CCPA 1962); In re Moore 439 F 2d. 1232, 169 USPQ 236 (CCPA 1969); In re Merat, 519 F 2d. 1390, 186 USPQ 471 (CCPA 1975).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 93-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

Art Unit: 1651

There is no specific and substantial utility to claimed invention. Applicant claims a "method of treating a patient" but does not claim to what end. What is being treated? A disease? A disorder? A treatment without a disclosed desired result can not be considered a specific substantial utility.

Claims 93-96 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial, specific asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Lankford whose telephone number is 571-272-0917. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1651

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Leon B Lankford Jr Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651